



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/926,221 | 01/15/2002 | Jorgen Bjorkner | 213854US2PCT | 2170 |

22850 7590 02/08/2006

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

SHAW, PELING ANDY

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2144

DATE MAILED: 02/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/926,221 | BJORKNER ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Peling A. Shaw | 2144 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 November 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 31-54 and 56-60 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 31-54 and 56-60 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 31 and 58 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 January 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Amendment received on 11/10/2005 has been entered. A new ABSTRACT is amended. It is reviewed and accepted. Claims 31-54 and 56-60 are amended. Claim 55 is cancelled. Claims 31-54 and 56-60 are still pending.

Priority

2. This application is a 371 of PCT/SE00/00560 03/22/2000 with a priority SWEDEN 9901121-5 03/26/1999. The filing date is 01/15/2002.

Claim objections

3. Claims 31 and 58 are objected to because of the following informalities:
 - a. On lines 13-14 of claim 31, "site, and" and "and related information sites ..." should be corrected as "site, and" and "related information sites ...". For applying art, the correction is assumed to be there.
 - b. One line 1 of claim 58, "A method as ..." should be corrected as "The method as ...". For applying art, the correction is assumed to be there.

Appropriate corrections are required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application

Art Unit: 2144

designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 31-36 and 38-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by England (US 6144991 A), hereinafter referred as England.

- a. Regarding claim 31, England disclosed a system for communicating over an open computer network comprising: a first terminal (Fig. 13, 1208; column 30, line 35- column 32, line 20: client system) configured to access a first information site (Fig. 13, 1312; column 30, lines 39-52: client web browser) and to acquire a client program from a management unit (Fig. 13, 904: client-side component; column 30, lines 46- 52: client-side component is an applet to obtain information about its environment, i.e. URL and frame; column 31, lines 9-11: client side-component is contained in the HTML of the Web page); said client program reads an internet address of the first information site in a web crawler of said first terminals (Fig. 13, 904: client-side component; column 30, lines 46-52: client-side component is an applet to obtain information about its environment, i.e. URL and frame ; column 31, lines 9-11: client side-component is contained in the HTML of the Web page); said client program sends a message to said management unit, said message includes the internet address of the first information site (column 30, lines 61-67: instruct piper server when the client navigates the Web; column 31, lines 40-53: client link navigation notification); said management unit is configured to access a database and determine what world is associated with the internet address-of the first information site (Fig. 13, 502; column 26, lines 20-27: piper server; column 28, lines 52-60: querying all active sessions in a database); said first terminal is further configured to conduct a communication with

another terminal accessing a related information site (column 15, lines 8-12: communication via the browser-based network among piper server 502, HTTP server 1204, guide system 1206 and client system 1208), wherein said related information site is part of a same world as the first information sites and related information sites include identical information sites, information sites that are stored in the same place, information sites that have a same author, information sites that have a same specialty, and information sites that have a same publisher (column 5, line 9-54: collaborative tools for chat room application, videoconferencing, shared-pointer and pasteboard, and whiteboard).

- b. Regarding claim 32, England disclosed the system as claimed in claim 31, wherein either prepared or not prepared meetings are established on any website where users of the terminals do not need to search for special meeting places, said special places including at least a chat rooms (abstract; column 5, line 9-65; column 10, line 65-column 11, line 2; column 14, line 15-28).
- c. Regarding claim 33, England disclosed the system as claimed in claim 31, wherein said communication between the first terminal and another terminal is a direct communication (column 5, lines 1-54: real-time interpersonal communication, videoconferencing, shared-pointer and distributed pasteboard, whiteboard).
- d. Regarding claim 34, England disclosed the system as claimed in claim 33, wherein said direct communication is one of written and oral dialogue in real time (column 5, lines 1-54: real-time interpersonal communication, videoconferencing, shared-pointer and distributed pasteboard, whiteboard).

- e. Regarding claim 35, England disclosed the system as claimed in claim 31, wherein said communication between the first terminal and another terminal includes virtual meetings (column 5, lines 1-54: real-time interpersonal communication, videoconferencing, shared-pointer and distributed pasteboard, whiteboard).
- f. Regarding claim 36, England disclosed the system as claimed in claim 35, wherein said communication between the first terminal and another terminal includes making files accessible to all participants in said virtual meeting (column 5, lines 1-54: real-time interpersonal communication, videoconferencing, shared-pointer and distributed pasteboard, whiteboard).
- g. Regarding claim 38, England disclosed the system as claimed in claim 31, wherein said open computer network is Internet or other network, and at least one information site includes at least one web page, and wherein said other network includes at least an intranet (abstract; column 5, line 9-65; column 10, line 65-column 11, line 2; column 14, line 15-28; column 33, line 45-64).
- h. Regarding claim 39, England disclosed the system as claimed in claim 38, wherein said communication between the first terminal and another terminal is created between visitors to a same web page, or to a web page that is included in an identified amount of web pages (abstract; column 5, line 9-65; column 10, line 65-column 11, line 2; column 14, line 15-28; column 33, line 45-64).
- i. Regarding claim 40, England disclosed the system as claimed in claim 39, wherein said identified amounts of web pages include at least one of, web pages related to persons who have a common interest, web pages stored at a same server, web pages

stored at a same group of servers, web pages dealing with a same specialty, web pages belonging to a same organization, and web pages having a same publisher, author, or constructor (column 14, line 1-63).

- j. Regarding claim 41, England disclosed the system as claimed in claim 38, wherein said communication between the first terminal and another terminal is allowed on any web page (abstract; column 5, line 9-65; column 10, line 65-column 11, line 2; column 14, line 15-28; column 33, line 45-64).
- k. Regarding claim 42, England disclosed the system as claimed in claim 38, wherein current IP-address for each terminal is utilized to establish communication (column 20, line 4-20).
- l. Regarding claim 43, England disclosed the system as claimed in claim 39, wherein said database is configured to store information about users and information regarding appointment of said identified amount of web pages (column 28, line 52-60).

England disclosed all limitations of claims 31-36 and 38-43. Claims 31-36 and 38-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e).

- 5. Claims 47-48, 50-54 and 56-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by England (US 6144991 A), hereinafter referred as England.

- a. Regarding claim 47, England disclosed a method of creating virtual meetings in an open computer network between a first terminal (Fig. 13, 1208; column 30, line 35-column 32, line 20: client system) and another terminal accessing a related information site, the method comprising: accessing a first information site from a first

terminal (Fig. 13, 1312; column 30, lines 39-52: client web browser) and acquiring a client program from a management unit (Fig. 13, 904: client-side component; column 30, lines 46-52: client-side component is an applet to obtain information about its environment, i.e. URL and frame; column 31, lines 9-11: client side-component is contained in the HTML of the Web page), said client program reads an internet address of the first information site in a web crawler (Fig. 13, 904: client-side component; column 30, lines 46-52: client-side component is an applet to obtain information about its environment, i.e. URL and frame ; column 31, lines 9-11: client side-component is contained in the HTML of the Web page), sending a message to said management unit, said message including the internet address of the first information site (column 30, lines 61-67: instruct piper server when the client navigates the Web; column 31, lines 40-53: client link navigation notification), and establishing communications between the first terminal and another terminal accessing a related information site (column 15, lines 8-12: communication via the browser-based network among piper server 502, HTTP server 1204, guide system 1206 and client system 1208); accessing a database and determining what world is associated with the internet address of the first information site (Fig. 13, 502; column 26, lines 20-27: piper server; column 28, lines 52-60: querying all active sessions in a database), and wherein the related information sites include identical information sites, information sties that are stored in the same place, information sites that have a same author, information sites that have a same specialty, and information sites that

- have a same publisher (column 5, line 9-54: collaborative tools for chat room application, videoconferencing, shared-pointer and pasteboard, and whiteboard).
- b. Regarding claim 48, England disclosed the method as claimed in claim 47, wherein said virtual meetings are established independent of a location of participants of the virtual meeting or address in the network (abstract; column 5, line 9-65; column 10, line 65-column 11, line 2; column 14, line 15-28).
 - c. Regarding claim 50, England disclosed the method as claimed in claim 47, wherein participants of said virtual meeting are given information about an address of other participants (column 20, line 4-20).
 - d. Regarding claim 51, England disclosed the method as claimed in claim 47, wherein participants of said virtual meeting can carry on one of a written and oral conversation (column 5, lines 1-54: real-time interpersonal communication, videoconferencing, shared-pointer and distributed pasteboard, whiteboard).
 - e. Regarding claim 52, England disclosed the method as claimed in claim 47, wherein files can be opened for participants of said virtual meeting (column 5, lines 1-54: real-time interpersonal communication, videoconferencing, shared-pointer and distributed pasteboard, whiteboard).
 - f. Regarding claim 53, England disclosed the method as claimed in claim 47, wherein participants of said virtual meeting can make files and documents accessible to other participants at said virtual meeting (column 5, lines 1-54: real-time interpersonal communication, videoconferencing, shared-pointer and distributed pasteboard, whiteboard).

Art Unit: 2144

- g. Regarding claim 54, England disclosed the method as claimed in claim 47, wherein said open computer network is Internet or other network (column 18, line 36-43; column 33, line 45-64).
- h. Regarding claim 56, England disclosed the method as claimed in claim 54, wherein said virtual meetings: are prepared or not prepared; and are established between visitors to web pages that are located within the same world, where a world is an amount of web pages that persons who have interests in common can be expected to visit (abstract; column 5, line 9-65; column 10, line 65-column 11, line 2; column 14, line 15-28).
- i. Regarding claim 57, England disclosed the method as claimed in claim 56, wherein modifications of web pages within the world, or of web servers from where said web pages are loaded to establish virtual meetings, are not needed (abstract; column 5, line 9-65; column 10, line 65-column 11, line 2; column 14, line 15-28).
- j. Regarding claim 58, England disclosed the method as claimed in claim 56, wherein web pages within a same world are either located to a same server, to a same node, deal with a same specialty, have a same author, have a same publisher, or belong to a same organization (column 14, line 1-63).
- k. Regarding claim 59, England disclosed the method as claimed in patent claim 54, wherein a support staff, or selling staff, of a company can see who is visiting the web site of the company and can communicate directly with these visitors (column 14, line 1-63).

1. Regarding claim 60, England disclosed the method as claimed in patent claim 54, wherein a current IP-address of each participant of the virtual meeting is utilized to establish communication between participants of the meeting (column 20, line 4-20).

England disclosed all limitations of claims 47-48, 50-54 and 56-60. Claims 47-48, 50-54 and 56-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 37, 44 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over England (US 6144991 A), hereinafter referred as England as applied to claims 31 and 38-39 above, and further in view of Tang et al. (US 5793365 A), hereinafter referred as Tang.

- a. England shows claims 31 and 38-39 as above. England does not show (claim 37) wherein said communication between the first terminal and another terminal includes distribution of address information and a picture of users of terminals.
- b. Tang shows (claim 37) wherein said communication between the first terminal and another terminal includes distribution of address information and a picture of users of terminals (column 5, line 13-24; column 10, line 51-column 11, line 3) in an analogous art for the purpose of managing interactions between users in a browser-based telecommunications network.

Art Unit: 2144

- c. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify England's functions of managing interactions between users in a browser-based telecommunications network with Tang's functions of user's personal information.
- d. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to identify a user's personal information Tan's teaching in an interactive among users application per England and Tan's teaching.
- e. Regarding claim 44, Tang shows wherein necessary resources for the first terminal, in addition to standard applications to create access to information, are loaded by the open computer network and installed at the first terminal (column 2, line 61-column 3, line 29; column 8, line 57-column 9, line 62).
- f. Regarding claim 46, Tang shows wherein said virtual meetings include at least one of: chatting (column 8, line 57-column 9, line 62), communication of files (column 8, line 57-column 9, line 62), management of files in common (column 8, line 57-column 9, line 62), access rights to communicated files and files in common (column 8, line 57-column 9, line 62), access to address information of the participants in the meeting (column 10, line 51-column 11, line 3), and showing of pictures of participants of the meeting (column 5, line 20-24).

Together England and Tang disclosed all limitations of claims 37, 44 and 46. Claims 37, 44 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 2144

7. Claim 45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over England (US 6144991 A), hereinafter referred as England as applied to claim 31 above, and further in view of Kakuta et al. (US 6714965 B2), hereinafter referred as Kakuta.

- a. England shows claim 31 as above. England does not show (claim 45) wherein users can register the information comprising: a picture of the user; identity information including the user name or organizational affiliation; address information, including an address to establish communication; and biographical data.
- b. Kakuta shows (claim 45) wherein users can register the information comprising: a picture of the user (column 8, line 22-29); identity information including the user name or organizational affiliation (column 8, line 22-29); address information, including an address to establish communication (column 8, line 22-29); and biographical data (column 8, line 22-29; column 13, line 39-42) in an analogous art for the purpose of group contacting system, and recording medium for storing computer instructions for executing operations of the contact system.
- c. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify England's functions of managing interactions between users in a browser-based telecommunications network with Kakuta's functions of group contacting system.
- d. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use a contacting system in establishing group communication per Kakuta's teaching in an interactive among users application per England and Kakuta's teaching.

Together England and Kakuta disclosed all limitations of claim 45. Claim 45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claim 49 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over England (US 6144991 A), hereinafter referred as England as applied to claim 47 above, and further in view of Tang et al. (US 5793365 A), hereinafter referred as Tang.

- a. England shows claim 47 as above. England does not show (claim 49) wherein participants of said virtual meeting are given information about identities of other participants, including at least one of a name, or an organizational affiliation and stored picture or direct transmission of moving picture.
- b. Tang shows (claim 49) wherein participants of said virtual meeting are given information about identities of other participants, including at least one of a name, or an organizational affiliation and stored picture or direct transmission of moving picture (column 5, line 20-24; column 10, line 51-column 11, line 3) in an analogous art for the purpose of providing a computer user interface enabling access to distributed workgroup members.
- c. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify England's functions of managing interactions between users in a browser-based telecommunications network with Tang's functions of user's personal information.
- d. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to identify a user's personal information in an interactive discussion window application per Tan's teaching.

Art Unit: 2144

Together England and Tang disclosed all limitations of claim 49. Claim 49 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed on 11/10/2005 have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive.
- a. In response to applicant's statements on "England does not describe or suggest a first terminal configured to acquire a client program from a management unit" and "England does not describe or suggest that said client program reads an internet address of the first information site in a web crawler of said first terminal ...". As laid out in the above rejection section, England shows that client-side component as an applet loaded from HTML of the Web page is used to gather the URL and frame information of client and use client link navigation notification to inform the guide system of the information collected.
 - b. In response to applicant's statements on "England does not describe or suggest said management unit is configured to access a database and determine what world is associated ..." England shows that the piper system is used to manage the session involving client(s) and the guide by querying a session database.
 - c. All amended claims are examined and addressed as above in the rejection sections.

Remarks

10. The following pertaining arts are discovered and not used in this office action. Office reserves the right to use these arts in later actions.

- a. Busey et al. (US 5764916 A) Method and apparatus for real time communication over a computer network
- b. Colyer et al. (US 6151621 A) Personal conferencing system
- c. Liang et al. (US 6766355 B2) Method and apparatus for implementing multi-user grouping nodes in a multimedia player
- d. SHEM-TOV et al. (WO 99/03034) SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR GENERATING A CHAT ROOM OVER A COMPUTER NETWORK

Conclusion

11. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Refer to the enclosed PTO-892 for details.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peling A. Shaw whose telephone number is (571) 272-7968. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 - 4:00.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

Art Unit: 2144

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

pas



DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100